

EXHIBIT F

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MPH TECHNOLOGIES OY,
Plaintiff,
v.
APPLE, INC.,
Defendant.

Case No. [18-cv-05935-TLT](#)

**QUESTIONS RE TENTATIVE RULING
GRANTING MPH'S REQUEST TO
REVISE ORDER CONSTRUING THE
'581 PATENT CLAIMS 6, 7, AND 8
UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 54(B)**

ECF Nos. 109, 118

The Court invites the parties to file responses to the questions below. The Court will consider the parties' responses in determining whether the tentative ruling becomes final.

- 1) **Question (for both parties):** Are the parties aware of any other related cases or proceedings, including those involving the '581 Patent? If so, please give the case name, number and date filed.
- 2) **Question (for both parties):** Did the patent inventors listed on the Exhibit G to ECF No. 1 (Inventors' names are Sami Vaarala and Anti Nuopponen) ever work for Apple or any other company that could have required them to release certain claims? If so, did they sign a contract, or otherwise agree, that they would not sue for patent infringement relating to the '581 Patent? If so, did that contract or agreement apply to any of the inventors' assignees?
- 3) **Question (for MPH):** Is there a contract evidencing the date and terms of the assignment of the '581 Patent? If so, do you think it is relevant to MPH's ability to bring infringement contentions relating to the '581 Patent?

1 If the parties agree to have the Court rule on the papers, and the parties also respond to the
2 questions before the end of the business day today, then the parties do not need to appear at
3 2:00pm today, March 19, 2024 for the hearing.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: March 19, 2024

6

TRINA L. THOMPSON
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
Northern District of California